

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claim 9 has been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

In the Office Action, the title of the invention has been objected to. Applicant submits that the title has been amended to reflect the claims of the present application.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Blatter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,348). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Blatter.

Blatter discloses a decoder conditional access system that incorporates different encryption systems for providing access to programs derived from different sources. A conditional access processor for processing encrypted program data and an associated encryption code includes a first algorithm means for decrypting the encryption code to provide an encryption key. The conditional access processor also includes a second algorithm means for encrypting the encryption key and the second encryption algorithm is different to the first encryption algorithm. A datastream representing the program is generated from encrypted program data and an associated encryption code. The encryption code is decrypted to provide an encryption key using a first algorithm. The encryption key is encrypted using a second algorithm different to the first encryption algorithm and the program datastream is formed from the encrypted program data and the encrypted encryption key. The program datastream is decrypted by selecting between a first and a second decryption algorithm and by decrypting the encryption code to provide an encryption key.

The encryption key is used to decrypt the encrypted program. A storage medium data format for recording encrypted program data is also disclosed. See Blatter at Abstract.

Claim 1 of the present application recites monitoring page table entries corresponding to memory buffers to determine whether a second application program has accessed the memory buffers. Applicant submits that nowhere in Blatter is there disclosed a mechanism that monitors page table entries corresponding to memory buffers to determine whether a second application program has accessed the memory buffers. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Blatter.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and include additional features. Thus, claims 2-8 are also patentable over Blatter.

Claim 9 recites a decryption module to monitor access to a memory device to determine if memory buffers storing data content have been accessed by a second application prior to decoding of the data content. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 9 is patentable over Blatter. Because claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and include additional features, claims 10-13 are also patentable over Blatter.

Claim 14 recites monitoring page table entries corresponding to memory buffers to determine whether a second application program has accessed the memory buffers. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 14 is patentable over Blatter. Because claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and include additional features, claims 15-20 are also patentable over Blatter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.


The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 14, 2005



Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980